REMARKS

By the present amendment, claims 1 and 2 have been amended to obviate the examiner's objections thereto and/or to further clarify the concepts of the present invention. Dependent claims 8 and 9 have been added. Support for the amendment to claim 1 as well as new claims 8 and 9 in terms of the characteristics of the clip are set forth on lines 18-22 of page 8 of the subject specification. Entry of these amendments is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the drawings were objected to for not showing all the features as presently claimed. Specifically, it was alleged that the subject matter as claimed in claim 6 was not shown in the drawings and thus the drawings must be amended to show this subject matter. Reconsideration of this objection is requested.

It is submitted that the examiner has not appreciated that which was disclosed in the specification and also shown in the drawings. The subject matter of claim 6 is disclosed as the second embodiment of the invention as set forth on line 25 of page six to line 14 of page 7 taken in conjunction with Figs. 5 and 6 of the drawings. Thus, it is submitted that the claimed subject matter is already shown in the drawings.

Claims 1,4/1 and 6 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable

over the newly cited patent to Johnson et al in view of the patent to Ikeda et al. In making this rejection, it was asserted that the Johnson et al patent publication teaches the entire fluid control apparatus as set forth in the noted claims with the exception of the provisions of (1) a tape heater on opposite sides of the line and (2) the line being supported by a line support member removably attached to a base member. The Ikeda et al patent was then cited to supply both of these teaching deficiencies. Reconsideration of this rejection in view of the above claim amendments and the following comments is respectfully requested.

From a careful review, it is submitted that neither the cited Johnson et al patent and the Ikeda et al patent teaches a line support member removably attached to a base member as presently claimed. In addition, claim 1 has been amended to further distinguish over the cited patents by further defining the characteristics of the clip in securing the tape heater. It is to be noted, in distinct contrast, the tape heater according to the Ikeda et al patent is secured by a bracket affixed by screws. It is submitted that the subject invention utilizing a clip distinguishes over the disclosed bracket.

For the reasons stated above, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and allowance of claims 1, 4/1 and 6 as amended over the cited patents are respectfully requested.

Independent claim 2 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the above patent to Johnson et al in view of the previously cited patent to Lengstorf. In making this rejection, the Johnson et al patent was relied upon as above and then it was asserted that the Lengstorf patent teaches the use of a support member having a heater insertion bore along the length thereof and a sheath heater inserted in the bore. Reconsideration of this rejection in view of the above claim amendments and the following comments is respectfully requested.

Claim 2 was rejected in the prior Action as being anticipated by the teachings of the cited Lengstorf patent. The claim was amended to recite the sliding capability of the coupling members in the line support member and the slidability of the control devices in the coupling members which allegedly are shown in the Johnson et al patent. However, neither patent teaches a line support member removably attached to a base member as presently claimed.

In addition, with respect to the subject matter of claim 2 as amended, the patent to Lengstorf does not have the structure composed of "an upper stage, a lower stage, a line support member and a base member." Thus, even the combined teachings of the Lengstorf and Johnson et al patents would not lead to the structure of a fluid controller having "a sheath heater being mounted in a line support member."

For the reasons stated above, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of claim 2 over the cited patents are respectfully requested.

Dependent claim 3 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the above cited patent to Johnson et al in view of the above cited patents to Ikeda et al and Lengstorf. Similarly, claims 2-5 and 7 were rejected the above cited patent to Johnson et al in view of the above cited patents to Ikeda et al and Lengstorf. Reconsideration of these rejections in view of the above claim amendments and the following comments is respectfully requested.

The above remarks relative to the teaching deficiencies of the Johnson et al, Lengstorf and Ikeda et al patent are reiterated with regard to these rejections. It is submitted that these patents, whether taken singly or in combination, do not teach or suggest the fluid control apparatus as defined in these claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of claims 2-5 and 7 over the cited patents are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the subject application is now in condition for allowance and early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

In the event this paper is not timely filed, the undersigned hereby petitions for an

appropriate extension of time. The fee for this extension may be charged to Deposit Account No. 01-2340, along with any other additional fees which may be required with respect to this paper.

Respectfully submitted,

KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP

Donald W. Hanson
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27,133

Atty. Docket No. 040549
Suite 400, 1420 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 659-2930
DWH/rab

23850
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE